DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 021 571 LI 000 618

FEASIBILITY OF SCHOOL AND COLLEGE LIBRARY PROCESSING THROUGH PUBLIC LIBRARY SYSTEMS IN NEW YORK STATE. A REPORT FOR THE NEW YORK STATE LIBRARY.

Nelson Associates, Inc., New York, N.Y.
Pub Date Mar 66
Note- 60p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$2.48
Descriptors- CATALOGING, CATALOGS, *COLLEGE LIBRARIES, FEASIBILITY STUDIES, LIBRARY ACQUISITION, *LIBRARY COOPERATION, *LIBRARY TECHNICAL PROCESSES, PUBLIC LIBRARIES, *SCHOOL LIBRARIES
Identifiers- *New York State

This document examines the feasibility of including school and college libraries in a public library centralized processing system proposed in LI 000 343, "Centralized Processing for the Public Libraries of New York State" (Nelson Associates for the New York State Library, 1966). It is concluded that school and college libraries should not be included in the proposed system at first since their inclusions would result in delays in service to all libraries involved. However, there is no reason why a joint program for processing school, college, and public library materials might not be established in the long run. Analysis of the school and college library reaction to a questionnaire on centralized processing is appended. (CC)

FEASIBILITY OF SCHOOL AND COLLEGE LIBRARY PROCESSING THROUGH PUBLIC LIBRARY SYSTEMS IN NEW YORK STATE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FEASIBILITY OF SCHOOL AND COLLEGE LIBRARY PROCESSING THROUGH PUBLIC LIBRARY SYSTEMS IN NEW YORK STATE

A Report for The New York State Library

Nelson Associates, Incorporated

March 1966

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY New York State Library

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

This report is submitted solely for the information and benefit of the client to whom it is addressed.

NELSON ASSOCIATES INCORPORATED • 845 THIRD AVENUE, NEW YORK, N Y 10022 • 212 HA 1-3110

March 21, 1966

Miss Jean L. Connor, Director
Division of Library Extension
The New York State Library
Albany, New York

Dear Miss Connor:

It is a pleasure for us to submit this report on the feasibility of centralized public library processing operations providing services for school and college libraries in the state. We hope that the information and judgements contained herein will prove helpful in your assessment of this particular aspect of library service.

Six main factors were taken into account in analyzing the issue before us— the attitude of schools and colleges toward such a service, the potential added volume of processing from schools and colleges, the nature of their processing requirements, the effect on quality of service of the additional workload, the costs involved, and the relevance of the timetable for the proposed new operation to the needs of the schools and colleges.

We have concluded that, on balance, the decisive considerations are adverse to the inclusion of services to schools and colleges at the outset of the recommended system. These decisive considerations are the timetable for the proposed plan, which cannot meet the urgent needs of the schools, and the probability that inclusion of the schools and colleges would cause delays in service to the public libraries at least at the early stages. It appears, however, that there are no inherent reasons— arising from the nature of the cataloging and preparation requirements of the schools and colleges— why a common program could not be developed in the long run.

Working with us on the study were Dr. Maurice Tauber, Melvil Dewey Professor of Library Science, School of Library Service, Columbia University, who served as a consultant to our staff, and two professional librarians, Dr. Seoud Matta and Richard J. Hyman.

Dr. Matta assisted on various aspects of the study, including the analysis of school library cataloging differences in Appendix A. Mr. Hyman assisted with the analysis of college library cataloging differences. We express our appreciation to each of the above and in addition wish to acknowledge our indebtedness to the many librarians and administrators in New York State who have assisted us throughout the survey.

We will be happy, of course, to answer any questions which you or your colleagues may have in connection with this report or furnish any further amplification of it which may seem desirable.

Yours very truly,

NELSON ASSOCIATES, INCORPORATED

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Letter of Transmittal

T E X T

FEASIBILITY OF SCHOOL AND COLLEGE LIBRARY PROCESSING THROUGH PUBLIC LIBRARY SYSTEMS IN NEW YORK STATE 1

Attitudes Toward Centralized Processing 3
Potential Volume 4
Nature of the Requirements 7
Quality of Service 9
Costs 10
Timetable 11
Conclusion 11

A P P E N D I X E S

Appendix A SCHOOLS 1

Centralized Processing Questionnaire 1
Interest in Centralized Processing 3
Volume Projected 5
School Library—Public Library Cataloging Differences 9
School Library—Public Library Cataloging Overlap 12
Effect of Federal Aid 13
Exhibit I. Acquisition and Processing of School Library Material 15
Exhibit II. Study of Centralized Processing in New York State Public Library Systems 18

		Page
Appendix B	COLLEGES	1
	Centralized Processing Questionnaire	1
	Interest in Centralized Processing	3
	Volume Projected	5
	College Library—Public Library Cataloging Differences	8
	College Library—Public Library Cataloging Overlap	11
	Effect of Federal Aid	12
	Exhibit I. Acquisition and Processing of College Library Material	15
	Exhibit II. Study of Centralized Processing in New York State Public Library Systems	20

LIST OF TABLES

			Page
Text	Table 1.	Estimated Processing Volume Statewide Processing	7
Appendix A	Table A-1.	Preferred Centralized Processing System	4
	Table A-2.	Public School Systems and Enrollments Represented: Conditions for Acceptance of Centralized Processing	6
	Table A-3.	Public School Systems—Cumulative Enrollments by Time-Cost Specifications	7
	Table A-4.	Estimated Volumes of Centralized Processing for Upstate School Systems According to Time-Cost Specifications	10
	Table A-5.	School Library Catalog Card Sample	11
	Table A-6.	School Titles—Public Library Cataloging Match	12
Appendix B	Table B-1.	Most Desirable Plan for Centralization (First Choice)	4
	Table B-2.	College-Level Institutions—Estimated Items Added According to Time-Cost Specifications	6
	Table B-3.	College-Level Institutions— Estimated Volume by Time-Cost Specifications	7
	Table B-4.	College Library Catalog Card Sample	9

		Page
Table B-5.	College Titles—Public Library Cataloging Match	11
Table B-6.	Estimated Annual Purchases of Materials for College and University Libraries in New York State Generated by Higher Education Act	14

FEASIBILITY OF SCHOOL AND COLLEGE LIBRARY PROCESSING THROUGH PUBLIC LIBRARY SYSTEMS IN NEW YORK STATE

This report supplements a concurrent study[1] of the desirability of further centralizing the processing operations of the public library systems of New York State. In that study the conclusion is reached that further centralization is desirable; the recommended plan calls for a single cataloging-acquisition center for the state and six preparation centers — three upstate and the continuation of one such center in each of the three New York City systems. The plan calls for extensive application of electronic data processing methods and it is estimated that due to the amount of system design and programming involved, a period of about five years will be required from the date of decision to proceed until the system is fully operational.

The study reported herein examines the question whether the recommended centralized system should also offer its services to schools and colleges in the state. Private as well as public schools are included in the scope of the inquiry. However the public schools in New York City are not included in the present study. The question of their processing needs being handled by a centralized processing operation also serving public libraries is dealt with in a third related report.[2]

The idea of including processing for both college and school libraries in any statewide system of centralized processing serving public libraries has the appeal of a certain innate logic. Theoretically, if a system is designed to serve all the processing needs of the public libraries in the state, it should be possible to introduce into the design the means to handle as well the similar requirements of the school and college libraries. Such an arrangement might offer opportunities to

---

1 Centralized Processing for the Public Libraries of New York State, Nelson Associates, Incorporated, for the New York State Library, 1966.

2 The Feasibility of Further Centralizing the Technical Processing Operations of the Public Libraries of New York City, Nelson Associates, Incorporated, for the Brooklyn Public Library, The New York Public Library and the Queens Borough Public Library, 1966.

achieve economies of scale just because of the greater volume of processing to be done if public, college and school library needs were all met by a single operation. This report examines the feasibility of such a program.

Six main factors enter into the assessment:

1. Attitude: How willing are colleges and upstate public school systems to contract for processing services with public library processing centers?

2. Volume: What is the potential additional volume?

3. Requirements: Are the processing requirements similar for the three types of libraries?

4. Quality of Service: Would the added volume and differences in requirements affect adversely the ability of the system to provide good service?

5. Costs: Would the added volume reduce unit costs? What are the schools and colleges prepared to pay for processing services from a public library center?

6. Timetable: Would the proposed centralized processing services for the public libraries be able to undertake school and college work soon enough to meet their demands?

The remainder of this report discusses these questions in turn.

In certain parts of this discussion special emphasis is placed on the answers to questionnaires sent to colleges and school systems in the state. A copy of the questionnaire sent to upstate school systems appears as Exhibit I at the end of Appendix A. A copy of the questionnaire sent to colleges appears as Exhibit I at the end of Appendix B. The respective appendixes also contain detailed analyses of the questionnaire returns.

Questionnaires were also sent to 18 private schools and school systems in the state. Of these, four were returned. Of the four returned, three expressed an interest in centralized processing but

doubted the feasibility of doing such work on a statewide basis. It was decided that no inferences could be drawn concerning the potential processing demand which could be expected from private schools on the basis of such a limited and qualified set of responses. (See Appendix A.) The discussion which follows is limited to public school systems and to the colleges.

ATTITUDES TOWARD CENTRALIZED PROCESSING

Before reporting the attitudes of respondents toward the proposed service an important reservation concerning the results is expressed. Whenever questions are asked concerning a prospective future service the reliability of the responses is open to question. Potato chips no doubt had to be actually tasted before they could be yearned for. If attitude were the decisive factor in the equation it would perhaps be as reliable to assess the opinions of the few school systems now actually contracting for such services from existing system centers as to inquire generally throughout the state. However such a broad inquiry was essential for other purposes connected with the study; attitudes were gleaned in the process.

The majority of both public school systems and colleges responding indicated an interest in centralized processing. Of the 47 public school systems which returned questionnaires, 34 (72% of those returning questionnaires) said they did see an advantage in the centralization of acquisitioning and processing of school library materials on a statewide basis, 12 (26%) saw no advantage, and one (2%) said any advantage would depend on the way in which such an operation were organized. Of the 49 colleges responding, 40 (82% of those returning questionnaires) said they saw advantages in statewide centralization in acquiring and processing college library materials. Also, the majority of both public school systems and colleges—though favorably inclined towards participating in centralized processing—expressed a preference that such centralization be by type of library served rather than inclusive of both the libraries of educational institutions and public libraries. The college libraries responding expressed this view somewhat more strongly than did the school systems.

Of the 43 school system replies expressing a preference as to type of processing facility which should serve them, 33 (77% of those expressing a preference) chose first one which would serve school libraries alone. This preference for school-oriented facilites was also

true of nearly all of the second choices in processing facilities made by these 33 systems.

Of 40 colleges which indicated a preference in processing facility, 33 (82% of those expressing a preference) were in favor of centralized processing centers serving college libraries only. This position was reaffirmed in the second choice expressed, when 28 of 35 again favored centers serving only colleges, even if offering different services.

This preference for centers serving only one type of client would seem to be more significant in the case of the private colleges than it might be for public schools. Among private institutions there is, perhaps, less readiness and certainly fewer well-established administrative procedures for coordinating or standardizing their practices.

POTENTIAL VOLUME

Considering first the public school systems, certain relationships were assumed between enrollment, book budgets, and information on the questionnaires returned from school systems that might use a centralized processing service. On the basis of these relationships, it is estimated that a volume of about 150,000 items might be acquisitioned and processed annually for upstate public school systems by a centralized processing network serving both public libraries and school systems.

In addition, the school libraries are now beginning to have to deal with processing materials financed under Title II of the Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). This Title deals with school library resources, textbooks and other instruction materials. As is discussed in detail in Appendix A of this report, it appears that in the first year of this act (July 1965-June 1966) Title II will finance the purchase of nearly half as many items for upstate school libraries as are now being bought annually for these libraries. If the relationships assumed above held true for the processing of the ESEA items, this would add another 75,000 items to the estimated total to be processed on behalf of public school systems using the recommended system.

In New York, as elsewhere, there is concern as to how these additional library materials will be processed. The solution of the

problem is being pursued in a number of directions. As other processing facilities now available prove inadequate to meet the demand, it is probable that the number of items which schools in the near future might want to send to a processing center would be greater than is now estimated; some of those answering the school questionnaires may not have taken fully into account the difficulties to be expected in processing the material bought for school libraries under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

In estimating the college volume the following private institutions were considered: four-year colleges, universities with negligible graduate enrollments, specialized higher institutions below the graduate level, two-year colleges and other institutions classified as junior colleges. No research institutions or universities with substantial numbers of graduate students were taken into account because it was assumed that the processing requirements of their libraries would be too complex to be met efficiently by a centralized processing operation serving public libraries.

In addition, no public institutions were included in the estimate. The attitude of the State University of New York towards such a processing arrangement was sought. It was found that SUNY is now deeply involved in developing an integrated program of service among the libraries of its many units and that until this program is much farther along it will apparently not be possible to gauge how, if at all, SUNY's library materials processing needs might be met by the recommended system. It is expected that this will be true of SUNY's situation for some years to come. The needs of the City University of New York were not included in the inquiry because it was felt that with substantial graduate enrollments, its library materials processing needs would be too complex to be efficiently handled by the contemplated processing arrangements.

The questionnaires sent to the colleges requested more information than did those sent to school systems. Therefore, it was possible to make an estimate of the college volume based upon the returned college questionnaires. The estimate is that some 40,000 items annually might be acquired and processed for the colleges. (For more details see Appendix B.)

It is also possible that the purchase of additional materials may be financed for the college level institutions of the state through the operation of Title II of the Federal Higher Education Act. (This Title and its possible implications for New York State are discussed in more detail in Appendix B of this report.) Like ESEA, discussed above, the Higher Education Act has been enacted into law. Unlike ESEA, however, at this writing no money has been appropriated to fund the provisions of its Title II, which is concerned in large part with the financing of the purchase of materials for college and university libraries. It is not clear what, if any, funds will be appropriated for this Title either for this fiscal year or for succeeding ones.

It is still possible, however, to estimate the potential effect of such funds (including the matching monies which some of the Title's provisions require) although the estimates can only be rough because of the basic uncertainties involved. Two estimates have been made which indicate that if the full authorized funds are appropriated they might annually add about 50 to 75% to the college level volume estimated above, or some 20,000 to 30,000 items. The lower estimate assumes that the institutions purchasing the original 40,000 items estimated would each obtain a basic grant, and would receive supplemental and special purpose grants in the proportion that their full-time students are of total full-time students in the state. It appears that, if fully funded, Title II of the Higher Education Act would finance items equal to about three-quarters of the present annual total of items added annually by the libraries of the college level institutions in the state. The higher estimate is based on the assumption that what is true of the state as a whole would also be true of the institutions using the recommended system. It should be noted that the results of actual experience might vary considerably from these estimates because of the effect of any supplemental and special purpose grants which may finally be made and the difficulty of predicting at this time what grants would be made and to which institutions.

Table 1 below summarizes the estimated volume which might be expected by the recommended system from the various types of libraries.

Table 1

ESTIMATED PROCESSING VOLUME
STATEWIDE PROCESSING SYSTEM
(Total Items)

Public Libraries	Public School Libraries	Private College Libraries
2,100,000 [a]	150,000 [b]	40,000 [c]

a Based on volume processed by 22 systems processing centers in 1964 or fiscal year 1964-65.

b Based on responses to questionnaire sent school systems and excluding effect of purchases under Elementary and Secondary Education Act. (See Appendix A.)

c Based on responses to questionnaire sent private colleges and similar institutions and excluding effect of any purchases which may be financed under Higher Education Act. (See Appendix B.)

It should be emphasized these figures represent only rough estimates. For example, as indicated, the estimate for the schools may be substantially understated because of the processing which is now being generated by the federally financed purchase of library materials. The estimate for college materials may be understated if increased purchases are financed under the Higher Education Act, but it is very difficult to tell whether there will be such an increase and if so how big it will be, because of the many fundamental uncertainties in this situation at this writing.

NATURE OF THE REQUIREMENTS

There appears to be little difference in the type of processing needed for public libraries and for public schools. Cataloging—both as to content and actual titles to be cataloged—as conceived in the recommended public library plan would, it appears, more than adequately meet the needs of public schools. In regard to duplication of titles

cataloged for school and public libraries, research for this study indicates that in a recent year 94% of the titles purchased by a major upstate school system either were cataloged in the same year or were cataloged in another year by at least one of the New York City public library systems. (See Appendix A.)

Neither are the dissimilarities between the processing required for the public libraries and private colleges such as to preclude a public library processing center adequately serving the private colleges. The system proposed for the public libraries envisages providing both Library of Congress and Dewey Decimal classifications, which would meet the colleges' requirements. Again, as with the schools, research indicates that most of those titles which would have to be cataloged for the college libraries would also have to be cataloged to meet the requirements of public libraries. A systematic sample of titles from a recent year's issues of the magazine Choice (a selection tool widely used by college libraries) when matched against the catalogs of the New York City public library systems showed that 98% of the titles in the sample were cataloged by the system in the same year or in another year. However, it is understood that for a substantial proportion of some colleges' acquisitions, there are no LC cards. Original cataloging might therefore be required for a part of a relatively small total volume of processing. This factor has cost implications which are treated in the next section.

While the recommended plan for the public libraries relies heavily upon book catalogs it would be necessary to produce full catalog card sets to meet the needs of the colleges and, to a lesser degree perhaps, for the schools. Individual book catalogs for the college libraries would be economically out of the question, while a single book catalog for the variety of colleges which might be using the system would seem to be of questionable value for any of them, even if such a union catalog were economically feasible.

In summary, it appears that a system serving the public libraries will be cataloging or will have cataloged nearly all the titles purchased by public school libraries, though perhaps not as completely for college libraries. Furthermore, in regard to cataloging, it also appears that the cataloging required by public school and private college libraries for their materials is not substantially different from that required by the public libraries for their materials. Though there are some differences in this area between public and college libraries—

differences, perhaps, greater than those which must be resolved when public libraries join together for common cataloging— these differences are not so great that they would automatically preclude the possibility of joint cataloging for the two types of libraries. The question of Library of Congress classification for the college libraries is not so serious as it would be if one of the large public library systems in the state— Buffalo and Erie County— were not already using LC classification. Any system which hoped to perform the bulk of all cataloging needed for the public libraries would have to be designed to handle a considerable amount of LC classification in any case.

QUALITY OF SERVICE

Would the added volume and differences in requirements affect adversely the ability of the system to provide good service? The evidence suggests that an adverse effect is probable at least at the outset.

The proposed plan of centralization for the public libraries calls for six preparation centers and one cataloging-acquisition center, as noted earlier. The reasoning in support of the six preparation centers as against a single one or fewer than six is based upon the available data concerning economic and efficient size. The data suggest [1] that efficient and economical service can be provided at a volume level of 400,000 units per year. Although it is quite possible that preparation centers can operate efficiently at higher volumes there is no evidence to suggest that economies would be substantial, and it is expected that at the outset it would be undesirable to schedule workloads substantially in excess of 400,000 units because of the possibility of backlogs developing, resulting in turn in delivery slowdowns and thus a deterioration in quality of service.

If the evidence had pointed to the establishment of a single preparation center for the public libraries, and if in addition it had appeared that such a center would operate more efficiently if it could obtain a work volume in excess of that which the public libraries can provide, then a strong case could be made for incorporating the school

---

1 See especially Appendix D, Exhibit I of Centralized Processing for the Public Libraries of New York State, Nelson Associates, Incorporated, for The New York State Library, 1966.

and college preparation function. The case is quite to the contrary, at least for the initial period of operation.

With respect to cataloging, it has been pointed out in the section above that the output required for the schools and colleges would probably be markedly different from that needed under the proposed public library plan—full sets of catalog cards as against a predominant book catalog format. Thus the extension of catalog output to include these added libraries would not be based upon the elimination of duplicate effort and cost and could have the effect of slowing service. The obvious exception to this is the cataloging effort itself. If complete agreement could be reached on cataloging rules and practices (if in other words a parallel intellectual effort were not required to meet the needs of the schools and colleges) then the advantages of cataloging at once for all three types of libraries could be obtained. It is difficult to believe, however, that such an agreement could be achieved without delaying the inception of cataloging for the public libraries.

COSTS

Would the added volume reduce costs? The answer is implicit above and in the report which this study supplements. If it were apparent that added volume above the level projected for the proposed preparation centers would reduce costs at acceptable levels of service quality, a smaller number of such centers would be recommended.

What are the schools and colleges prepared to pay for processing services from a public library center? Some evidence of the answer to this question can be gleaned from the questionnaire responses. The volume projections in Table 1 above are based on those school systems and colleges which indicated they are prepared to pay $1 per item processed and delivered in a period of four to six weeks from ordering. As the material in the appendixes shows, when the prospective charge goes above $1, the interest in centralized processing on the part of school and college libraries diminishes quickly. For items delivered in four weeks for which $1 is charged for the processing, it is projected that the volume bought by the school systems would be 154,629. However when the charge goes to $1.25, the volume to be expected drops to 26,434. For colleges, at six weeks and $1 an item, a volume of 39,095 items is projected. For colleges, at six weeks and $1.25 an item, the volume projected is 19,460 items. Thus it seems likely

that item charges above $1 would tend to substantially reduce the volume of school and college materials processed. Since the projections indicate that the per item costs of the recommended system (exclusive of catalog output furnished) will be about $1.10, it can be seen that if the charge to schools and colleges were higher than that figure the demand for the service might well decline.

TIMETABLE

Would the proposed centralized processing services for the public libraries be able to undertake school and college work soon enough to meet their demands?

As has been indicated a period of five years is estimated as the necessary time in which the recommended plan can become fully operational. However, school library materials are already being purchased under Title II of the Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act. It is the relatively sudden influx of these additional materials which is putting the greatest strain on the present methods of processing materials for school libraries. In addition, it seems likely that if any program for the purchasing of college library materials under the Higher Education Act becomes a reality, this will happen before the recommended system is fully operational. Thus it seems reasonable to expect that by the time the recommended system is fully in operation, ways of processing federally financed materials (as well as those which would normally be acquired for school and college libraries in these years) will have been developed of necessity. In any case it is certain that the recommended system can be of no immediate help in solving what seems to be the quickly developing problem in the processing of school library materials.

CONCLUSION

On balance the decisive considerations are adverse to the inclusion of services to schools and colleges at the outset of the recommended system. These decisive considerations are the timetable for the proposed plan, which cannot meet the urgent needs of the schools, and the probability that inclusion of the schools and colleges would cause delays in service to the public libraries at least at the early stages. It appears, however, that there are no inherent reasons—arising from the nature of the cataloging and preparation requirements

of the schools and colleges— why a common program could not be developed in the long run.

In closing, note is taken of the fact that existing public library systems in the state have, in a few instances, taken on prccessing service to schools and colleges. Depending on the extent of such contracts at the time of transition to the recommended centralized plan, they could contribute to the ability of the new system to accommodate these added services with limited disruption.

SCHOOLS

CENTRALIZED PROCESSING QUESTIONNAIRE

A questionnaire was used to gauge the interest of public schools and private schools in having their library materials processed centrally along with materials for public libraries in the state. The questionnaire used also solicited information regarding the standards as to such things as speed and cost which would have to be met by the centralized processing operation if it were to satisfactorily serve the school system polled. The text of the questionnaire used is included at the end of this appendix as Exhibit I.

The response from the private schools can quickly be summarized before discussing at greater length the experience with the public schools. Eighteen questionnaires were sent out to as many private schools and school systems. Both religious and secular school organizations were sent questionnaires. The schools and school systems were those on a list of library supervisors in private schools and private school systems as of April 1965, furnished by the State Education Department.

Few of the questionnaires, only four of the 18 sent, were returned. Of those returned three expressed an interest in participating in the suggested service while the other expressed interest but doubts about the efficacy of attempting to do centralized processing on a statewide basis. It was decided that no valid inferences could be drawn as to the potential processing demand from private schools on the basis of this limited response to the questionnaires.

Any processing service which is either now or ultimately made available to public school libraries would presumably, as a matter of public policy, also be made available to private schools as well. The extremely limited response to the questionnaires by the private schools, however, provides no guidance for any decision as to the desirability of centralized processing for school libraries. The information received from public schools is more illuminating.

Questionnaires were sent to the superintendents of 95 public school systems throughout the state. The school systems were selected from seven different enrollment ranges as follows:

Enrollment Range	Total Number of School Systems In Enrollment Range	In Sample
300- 599	84	8
600- 1,199	161	15
1,200- 2,999	267	26
3,000- 5,999	124	14
6,000-11,999	49	12
12,000-24,999	16	16
25,000+	4*	4
Total	705	95

*Outside New York City. The largest single school system in the state, that of New York City, has been excluded from this study. The possibility of including the New York City schools in any centralized processing scheme for the three New York City public library systems is dealt with in The Feasibility of Further Centralizing the Technical Processing Operations of the Public Libraries of New York City. This report is cited in full in footnote 2 on page 1 of the main body of the present report.

A total of 47, or 49%, of the 95 school systems in the sample returned the questionnaire. These are the returns according to enrollment range:

Enrollment Range	Questionnaires Returned Number	As % of Total Sent to Systems in Enrollment Range
300- 599	3	38%
600- 1,199	7	47
1,200- 2,999	13	50
3,000- 5,999	8	57
6,000-11,999	8	67
12,000-24,999	8	67
25,000+	0	0
Total	47	49%

Interest in Centralized Processing

Of the 47 systems which returned questionnaires 34 (72%) said they did see an advantage in the centralization of acquisitioning and processing of school library materials on a statewide basis, 12 (26%) said they did not see any advantage in such a centralization, and one system (2%) said any advantages would depend upon the way in which the acquisitioning and processing were organized.

The questionnaire asked the respondent for the school system to rank, in order of desirability, four different plans for centralizing acquisition and processing activities. Two of the plans were for centers serving both public and school libraries—one center handling all activities, the other center handling ordering, billing, cataloging and catalog production, but not physical processing. The other two plans offered the same alternatives but for schools alone.

Table A-1 summarizes the replies to this question.

Four of the 47 questionnaires returned did not answer the question. Thirty-five of the remaining 43 chose as "most desirable" a plan for serving school libraries alone. These included one system which had marked two plans for school libraries as "most desirable," and one which had marked these two and a third, for both school and public libraries, as "most desirable." In addition to the one mentioned above, eight systems favored a plan serving both school and public libraries (five for centralizing all activities, one for centralizing all activities except physical processing, one for centralizing all activities except cataloging and catalog production, and one for both centralizing all activities and centralizing all activities except physical processing).

Because two systems indicated two plans for first choice and one system indicated three plans for first choice, there are 47 responses for the 43 systems shown in Table A-1.

The second choice of these 43 school systems were then analyzed (not tabulated here). Of the 35 systems favoring as first choice a plan for school libraries, only six did not indicate a second choice; all but a few of the others picked as second choice the other plan for school libraries only.

Of the nine systems favoring a center serving both school and public libraries, the bias in their second choice, as often as not, was for one of the "school only" center alternatives.

In looking at the combined responses for the first and second choices, a pattern emerged; it appears that the majority were tenacious

Table A-1

PREFERRED CENTRALIZED PROCESSING SYSTEM

Processing Activities to be Centralized	Institutions to be Served		
	Center for School and Public Libraries	Center for School Libraries Only	
		Statewide	County or Regional
Centralization of all activities	6a	20b, c	0
Centralization of all activities except physical processing	3a, b	13b, c	0
Centralization of all activities except book selection	0	1	0
Centralization of all activities except cataloging and catalog production	1	0	0
Activities undelineated	0	0	3

a One school system picked both of these plans as first choice.
b One school system picked these three plans as first choice.
c One school system picked both of these plans as first choice.

in the view that having the center for just school libraries was more important than the kinds of activities to be centralized.

Volume Projected

It was desirable to know the number of books that might be processed for public schools in a centralized system if one were operating. Assuming that this would depend on the unit cost of centralized processing and the delivery time which a processing center could provide, the school systems were asked to indicate the maximum cost per item they would be willing to pay for centralized processing services, and the maximum time interval they would accept between ordering and receiving the finished product.

Table A-2 presents the analysis for the 47 systems which replied to the questionnaire. The table shows for each unit cost and delivery time combination the number of systems that would be interested in centralized processing and the total enrollment of the system or systems interested.

The acceptable-cost mode among those responding is $1.00. Eleven systems indicated interest at this price; a further four systems indicated interest at higher prices or, in one case, "at any price."

The mode in the answers to the time interval figures is four weeks. Sixteen systems indicated interest at this interval, while eighteen other systems indicated interest at greater intervals, and one indicated interest regardless of time.

Table A-3 gives the cumulative enrollment in the systems that would be interested in centralized processing at a particular cost and delivery time combination. Thus if a system expressed interest in processing in four weeks at $1.25, it and its enrollment are included as well in the estimate of all those systems which would be interested in centralized processing for any price lower than $1.25 per item and delivery faster than four weeks. The percentages that the different cumulative enrollments comprised of the total enrollment of 668,100 students for the 95 systems in the sample are also shown.

On the basis of these data, it is possible to estimate the volume of demand among public school systems in the state (outside New York City) if the price for centralized processing and the delivery time were known.

Table A-2

PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEMS AND ENROLLMENTS REPRESENTED: CONDITIONS FOR ACCEPTANCE OF CENTRALIZED PROCESSING

Maximum Unit Cost at Which Interested	Maximum Acceptable Delivery Time																	
	No Limit		Ten Weeks		Eight Weeks		Six Weeks		Four Weeks		Two Weeks		No Time Indicated		Not Interested at Any Speed		Total	
	No.	E.E.*	No.	E.E.	No.	E.E.	No.	E.E.	No.	E.E.	No.	E.E.	No.	E.E.	No.	E.E.	No.	E.E.
Any cost	1	1,700	0		0		0		0		0		0		0		1	1,700
$2.00	0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0	
1.75	0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0	
1.50	0		0		0		0		1	12,000	0		0		0		1	12,000
1.25	0		0		0		2	1,400	0		0		0		0		2	1,400
1.00	0		1	2,300	1	11,000	6	44,100	3	15,800	0		0		0		11	73,200
.75	0		0		2	5,600	1	14,600	5	19,100	1	4,300	0		0		9	43,600
.50	0		0		2	9,900	0		5	24,300	0		0		0		7	34,200
.25	0		0		0		0		1	1,400	0		0		0		1	1,400
No unit cost maximum indicated	0		1	400	0		2	19,600	1	12,000	0		4	17,100	0		8	49,100
Not interested at any cost	0		0		0		0		0		0		0		7	47,600	7	47,600
Total	1	1,700	2	2,700	5	26,500	11	79,700	16	84,600	1	4,300	4	17,100	7	47,600	47	264,200

* Estimated enrollment according to Education Directory, 1964-65; Part 2, Public School Systems, of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Table A-3

PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEMS—CUMULATIVE ENROLLMENTS
BY TIME-COST SPECIFICATIONS

Maximum Unit Cost at Which Interested	Maximum Acceptable Delivery Time					
	Interested at Any Speed	Ten Weeks	Eight Weeks	Six Weeks	Four Weeks	Two Weeks
Interested at any cost	1,700 (0.25%)	1,700	1,700	1,700	1,700	1,700
$2.00	1,700	1,700	1,700	1,700	1,700	1,700
1.75	1,700	1,700	1,700	1,700	1,700	1,700
1.50	1,700	1,700	1,700	1,700	13,700 (2.05%)	13,700
1.25	1,700	1,700	1,700	3,100 (0.46%)	15,100 (2.26%)	15,100
1.00	1,700	4,000 (0.60%)	15,000 (2.25%)	60,500 (9.06%)	88,300 (13.22%)	88,300
.75	1,700	4,000	20,600 (3.08%)	80,700 (12.08%)	127,600 (19.10%)	131,900 (19.74%)
.50	1,700	4,000	30,500 (4.57%)	90,600 (13.56%)	161,800 (24.22%)	166,100 (24.86%)
.25	1,700	4,000	30,500	90,600	163,200 (24.43%)	167,500 (25.07%)

For example, considering those systems which found acceptable a maximum cost of $1.00 (the acceptable-cost mode) and a maximum delivery time of four weeks (the acceptable-delivery time mode) are seen by the table to have a total school enrollment of 88,300. From Table A-2, it is seen that 15 systems comprise this enrollment figure. The 15 systems represent 32% of the 47 school systems responding to the questionnaire, or 15% of the sample of 95 school systems. According to the Education Directory, 1964-65; Part 2, Public School Systems, of the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, these 15 systems had a total 1964-65 enrollment of 88,300 students, or 13.22% of the total enrollment represented in the sample of 95 school systems.

An estimate of total demand based on the proportion the enrollment of these systems bears to the total sample of 95 is very conservative. It allows no factor for any interest in centralized processing among the 48 non-respondent libraries at a price of $1.00 per unit and a delivery time of four weeks. To extrapolate total demand on the basis of the ratio the 15 systems represent of the 47 respondent systems, would probably overestimate the true demand. The conservative base is therefore used in the following calculations.

It is assumed that the interest in centralized processing at the different levels of cost and speed among all of the upstate New York school systems would be the same as that found in our sample.

Total public school enrollment in the state (outside New York City) in 1964-65 was 1,988,400.

Books to be processed by a centralized processing system, it is assumed, would bear the same ratio to total new books added in upstate New York systems as the enrollment in interested systems bears to total enrollment in the sample systems.

An estimate of total new library books added during 1964-65 was then computed. The Bureau of Statistics of the New York Department of Education reports that the per pupil expenditure, based on weighted average daily attendance, for new library books purchased with capital funds has increased from $1.51 in the 1959-60 school year to $2.02 for 1963-64. Assuming a similar rate of increase, per pupil expenditure for 1965-66 has been estimated to be $2.12. According to the U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, "weighted average daily attendance" is calculated at 1.01 of enrollment figures. Applying this factor to the enrollment figure of 1,988,400 gives a total weighted average daily attendance of 2,008,284 pupils. The estimated total expenditures for new library books

for the state, excluding New York City, was therefore $4,257,562. ($2.12 expenditure per pupil x 2,008,284 weighted average daily attendance of pupils.)

The next step was to determine how many new books were added, based on the estimated total expenditure as indicated above. The National Inventory of Library Needs, 1965 of the American Library Association estimates that, in centralized systems serving 150 or more pupils, the average discount cost of a public school library book was $3.64 in 1963.[1] The estimated total book expenditures for upstate New York divided by this amount determines the approximate number of new library books added during the 1964-65 school year—1,169,660; 13.22% of this total (representing the school systems which would be interested in having their library books processed for $1.00 each and at four weeks delivery) would be 154,629.

Following from the above calculations and using the enrollment percentages shown in Table A-3, it is possible to estimate the number of books to be processed for the school systems of upstate New York at alternative cost-time combinations. Table A-4 sets out for each cost-time combination the number of books to be processed, based on the total of 1,169,660 books added in upstate New York school systems in 1964-65.

SCHOOL LIBRARY—PUBLIC LIBRARY CATALOGING DIFFERENCES

To gain an understanding of the degree of the differences in cataloging practices between public and school libraries, some of the school systems which had expressed interest in participating in centralized processing on the general questionnaire sent to schools, were asked to send in copies of their main entry catalog cards for a list of titles. The titles chosen were picked to give a range of types of books and to present a variety of cataloging problems. The list is Exhibit II to this appendix. Twenty-seven school systems were requested to send in such cards. Thirteen systems returned some cards. Altogether 85 cards were returned from the 13 different systems, an average of about 6.5 cards

1 Prices in 1964 were probably slightly higher but no later equally reliable figure is available, and the difference should not significantly affect the final estimate.

Table A-4

ESTIMATED VOLUMES OF CENTRALIZED PROCESSING
FOR UPSTATE SCHOOL SYSTEMS
ACCORDING TO TIME-COST SPECIFICATIONS

Maximum Unit Cost at Which Interested	Maximum Acceptable Delivery Time					
	Interested at any Speed	Ten Weeks	Eight Weeks	Six Weeks	Four Weeks	Two Weeks
Interested at any cost	2,924	2,924	2,924	2,924	2,924	2,924
$2.00	2,924	2,924	2,924	2,924	2,924	2,924
1.75	2,924	2,924	2,924	2,924	2,924	2,924
1.50	2,924	2,924	2,924	2,924	23,978	23,978
1.25	2,924	2,924	2,924	5,380	26,434	26,434
1.00	2,924	7,018	26,317	105,971	154,629	154,629
.75	2,924	7,018	36,026	141,295	223,405	230,891
.50	2,924	7,018	53,453	158,606	283,292	290,777
.25	2,924	7,018	53,453	158,606	285,748	293,234
No cost indicated	2,924	7,837	54,155	193,579	341,775	349,260

from each system. Table A-5 shows by system and in total the number of Library of Congress cards received, the number of Wilson cards, and the number which were "homemade."

Table A-5

SCHOOL LIBRARY CATALOG CARD SAMPLE

	Number and Type of Card			
School System	LC	Wilson	"Homemade"	Total
A	0	0	12	12
B	0	0	9	9
C	5	0	2	7
D	0	0	8	8
E	0	5	0	5
F	2	2	0	4
G	5	0	0	5
H	0	0	1	1
I	0	0	11	11
J	0	2	1	3
K	5	1	2	8
L	3	1	1	5
M	0	0	7	7
Total	20	11	54	85
% of Total	23.5	12.9	63.5	100.0

Two of the systems returning their own cards indicated that they also used both Library of Congress and Wilson cards upon occasion but had not for any of the titles on the list sent them.

As for cards which had been produced within the library, in most cases they contained full formats: author-title, title statement (place, publisher and date—for the imprint); collation including pagination, illustration statement, and size; notes; and tracings. However, cards from two of the reporting libraries did exhibit shorter formats.

On balance, the cards returned indicate that, in general, the cataloging which is done for adult collections in public libraries would appear to satisfy the cataloging needs of high school libraries, and the cataloging done for the juvenile collections in the public libraries would satisfactorily fulfill the cataloging needs of the libraries in elementary schools.

SCHOOL LIBRARY—PUBLIC LIBRARY CATALOGING OVERLAP

To estimate the amount of additional cataloging which might be required if school libraries were served in a system cataloging for public libraries, a selection of titles bought by a school system in the state was chosen and checked against the union catalogs of the three New York City library systems. The titles were picked from among those purchased in 1962-63 by a major upstate school system. The lists offered a feasible way to gain useful insight into the problem, representing as they did the purchases of a growing school system with an active school library program.

One hundred three representative titles were picked from throughout the lists of those purchased by the school system for the town's school libraries at that time. They included titles for both elementary and high school libraries.

The search showed a high level of duplication between the school titles and the union catalogs of the three large systems. The results of the matching are shown below in Table A-6.

Table A-6

SCHOOL TITLES—PUBLIC LIBRARY CATALOGING MATCH

Total School Titles In Sample		Matching Public Library Titles					
		Titles Cataloged in 1962-63		Titles Cataloged Other Years		Titles Not Cataloged	
Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
103	100.0	7	6.8	90	87.4	6	5.8

Altogether 97 out of the 103 school titles, or 94.2%, had been cataloged in at least one of the New York City systems at some time.

Since the school system's lists included all titles which could be bought for the system's libraries at that time, the number of titles cataloged at other times by the New York City systems is considerably higher than it would have been if the lists included only the titles published, say, in the year just preceding the compilation of the lists. Had it been possible to make a comparison only between new titles published for school libraries in a recent period and the public library catalogs, it is believed the rate of match might have been somewhat lower, but not substantially so. Titles for school libraries tend to have a much longer life than titles for the adult library, but it should also be noted that school libraries, in general, choose from fewer titles in the first place. Thus it seems reasonable to believe that the above results represent a good approximation of the actual duplication in cataloging between school and public libraries in the state.

EFFECT OF FEDERAL AID

Since federal aid, specifically in the form of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), is expected to finance the purchase of great numbers of books and other materials for school libraries, the implications of this aid for the school libraries of New York State was investigated.

The three parts of ESEA under which funds might be provided for the purchase of books and other materials for school libraries or similar collections are Title I—Financial Assistance to Local Educational Agencies for the Education of Children of Low-Income Families and Extension of Public Law 874, Title II—School Library Resources, Textbooks and Other Instructional Materials, and Title III—Supplementary Educational Centers and Services.

Personnel of the New York State Education Department responsible for the coordination of the activities in the state under these Titles believe there will be little, if any, library materials financed under Titles I and III. As of January 1966, requests under Title I for library materials were said to be "practically nil," primarily because library material financing is obtainable under Title II. As far as Title III is concerned, it is expected that funds available for the supplementary educational centers will be used to emphasize such services as counseling, in-teacher training and the development of teaching materials.

In contrast to Titles I and III of ESEA, it is expected that substantial amounts of school library materials will be financed in New York State under the Act's Title II. Altogether some $8.3 million will be available to the state under this Title in the first year of the Act, with the expectation that similar or even larger amounts will be available under this Title for at least the four subsequent years of the Act. It is estimated by those at Albany involved in the administration of this Title that some $5,000,000 of the $8.3 million total will be spent on the purchase and processing of books for school libraries.

If, indeed, $5,000,000 of the federal money is spent on books for school libraries in New York State, it will substantially increase the number of books bought annually for the public school libraries in the state. It was estimated above that in 1964-65 about 1,170,000 volumes were bought for the libraries of the public school systems in the state outside New York City. This is aside from purchases of textbooks. Assuming an average price of $3.64 per volume[1] and adding $1.00 per volume allowed for processing, it is estimated that $5,000,000 of Title II money will buy some 1,080,000 volumes for the school libraries of the state. The distribution of Title II funds between upstate public, New York City public, and private school libraries will be made on the basis of the number of students enrolled in each type of school. In 1964-65, 52% of the students enrolled in grades kindergarten through 12th were in public schools outside New York City, 26% in the public schools of New York City, and the remaining 22% in private schools. Assuming from the foregoing that upstate schools would receive 52% of books purchased in the state under Title II, 560,000 volumes would be added to their libraries. The balance of 48%, 520,000, would go to the libraries of private schools and New York City public schools.

---

1 Based on figures from the American Library Association discussed above.

Exhibit I

ACQUISITION AND PROCESSING OF SCHOOL LIBRARY MATERIAL

In order to take full advantage of modern, money-saving equipment and techniques in the acquisition and processing of library and instructional materials, centralization of clerical and repetitive operations becomes a major factor. Among the many questions raised when considering the idea of centralization as applied to the acquisition, cataloging and processing of materials are the following:

a) How much does it cost? i.e., how much is the school system willing to pay?
b) What does the system get for what it pays?, and
c) How fast does the system get what it orders?

Any attempt at centralization of these services should consider carefully the foregoing questions.

Your answers to the following questions will be of decided importance in helping to improve school library service in the state.

1. Do you see any advantage in centralization of acquisition and processing of materials on a state-wide basis? Yes_____ No_____

2. Regardless of the answer to the preceding question, please fill in the appropriate columns below. Indicate your opinion as to whether you see advantages or disadvantages in the following list of possible areas of centralization by checking the appropriate column:

Areas Affected by Centralization	Advantages	Disadvantages
Accuracy of ordering and receiving	_____	_____
Speed of ordering and receiving	_____	_____
Efficiency of billing	_____	_____
Rates of discounts on materials purchased	_____	_____
Level of cataloging	_____	_____
Uniformity of catalogs	_____	_____
Accessibility of bibliographic information state-wide	_____	_____
Physical processing of library materials	_____	_____
Shipping and delivery of library materials	_____	_____
Service to students and teachers	_____	_____
Inter-library loans	_____	_____
Overall costs	_____	_____
Administration and communication	_____	_____

3. Assuming that a state-wide system for processing of materials for public libraries has, in addition, the capability of handling school library needs in the state, how would you rank the following alternatives in terms of desirability? (mark most desirable "1", second most desirable "2", and so on.)

a) Centralization of all activities in one center for both public and school libraries _____

b) Centralization of ordering, billing, cataloging, and catalog production for both public and school libraries, with decentralization of physical processing _____

c) Centralization of all activities in one center for school libraries alone _____

d) Centralization of ordering, billing, cataloging, and catalog production in one center for school libraries only, with decentralization of physical processing of books _____

e) Other (please specify)_____

_____

_____ _____

_____ _____

4. Does your school system maintain any cooperative plans with other systems involving the acquisition, processing, and use of library and instructional materials? Yes_____ No_____

If "Yes," which of the following areas are covered by your cooperative plans?

Acquisitions of books _____
Acquisitions of audio-visual materials _____
Cataloging and classification _____
Physical processing of materials _____
Use of other systems' materials centers _____
Inter-library loans _____
Other (please specify)

_____ _____

_____ _____

5. Please fill in the appropriate sections of this question.

Our school system would be:

a) Interested in centralized processing services only if the average cost per item does not exceed: $.50_____, $.75_____, $1.00_____, $1.25_____, $1.50_____.

b) Interested in centralized processing services only if the average time lag between ordering (a book published and in print, or any item available on the market) and receiving the finished product does not exceed: 2 weeks_____, 4 weeks_____, 6 weeks_____, 8 weeks_____, 10 weeks_____.

c) Interested in centralized processing services regardless of cost or speed because it is the only logical way to achieve certain services (reported in answers to question 2). _____

d) Not interested in centralized processing services in any case because we expect certain inherent problems (reported in answers to question 2). _____

Exhibit II

STUDY OF CENTRALIZED PROCESSING IN NEW YORK STATE PUBLIC LIBRARY SYSTEMS

Catalog Card Copies Requested: High School Titles List

Asimov, Isaac	The Human Brain, Illustrated by Anthony Ravielli, Houghton, 1964
Barth, Karl	God Here and Now, Harper & Row, 1964
Brecht, Bertolt	Brecht on Theatre, Hill & Wang, 1964
Bloomfield, Morton W.	A Linguistic Introduction to the History of English, Knopf, 1963
Crane, Stephen	The Complete Short Stories and Sketches, Edited by Thomas A. Gullason, Doubleday, 1963
Daiches, David	English Literature, Prentice-Hall, 1964
Dexter, Lewis A.	The Tyranny of Schooling, Basic Books, 1964
Dostoevsky, Fyodor	Crime and Punishment, Translated by Constance Garnett, Dodd, 1963
Douner, Marion	The Story of Design, Lothrop, 1963
Friedman, Maurice, ed.	The Worlds of Existentialism, Random House, 1964
Harris, Leon A.	The Fine Art of Political Wit, Dutton, 1964
Humphrey, Hubert H.	War on Poverty, McGraw-Hill, 1964
Kennedy, John F.	The Burden and the Glory, Foreword by Lyndon B. Johnson, Harper, 1964
Kennedy, John F.	Profiles in Courage, Memorial ed., Special foreword by Robert F. Kennedy, Harper & Row, 1964
Landers, Ann	Ann Landers Talks to Teen-Agers About Sex, Prentice-Hall, 1963

Catalog Card Copies Requested: High School Titles List

Ley, Willy	Planets, Doubleday, 1964
MacInnes, Helen	The Venetian Affair, Harcourt, 1963
Mencken, Henry Louis	The American Language, Knopf, 1963
Menninger, Karl A.	The Vital Balance, Viking, 1963
Pfeiffer, John E.	The Search for Early Man, American Heritage, 1963
Ruitenbeek, Hendrik M.	Psychoanalysis and Literature, Dutton, 1964
Selye, Hans	From Dream to Discovery, McGraw-Hill, 1964
Shippen, Katherine B.	The Heritage of Music, Viking, 1963
Toser, Marie A.	Library Manual, 6th ed., H. W. Wilson, 1964
Zimmerman, J. E.	Dictionary of Classical Mythology, Harper, 1964

COLLEGES

CENTRALIZED PROCESSING QUESTIONNAIRE

Questionnaires on centralized acquisition and processing of college library material were sent to 81 private institutions. These included four-year colleges, universities with only negligible graduate enrollments, specialized institutions below the graduate level, two-year colleges, and other institutions classified as junior colleges. No research level institutions were approached. The intent was, with these questionnaires, to reach every private college-level institution in the state which might be able to benefit from centralized processing in conjunction with public libraries. Thus, the colleges questioned were not a sampling but a complete coverage of the potential private college-level users of such a centralized processing system.

No public institutions were included in this survey. However, the attitude of the State University of New York regarding SUNY's possible participation in a centralized processing operation in conjunction with other institutions of higher learning, schools and public libraries was investigated. The state university has recently inaugurated a long-term program designed to bring all SUNY unit libraries up to desirable standards. This plan involves large expenditures and promises many radical innovations. A program already undertaken will computerize the combined library resources at the medical schools of the university. Future developments in SUNY libraries may be expected to benefit from the experience in this and other programs planned. Participation by SUNY in any other program would, understandably, depend upon developments within the university's own integrated library program.

Graduate schools and universities with large graduate student enrollments were excluded since their processing and cataloging needs are felt to be too complex to be handled in any overall scheme primarily designed to serve the needs of public libraries. For the most part, the institutions included in this survey were those private institutions classified by the U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare in their publication, Library Statistics of Colleges and Universities 1963-64, as

"fine arts," "junior college," "technical institute," "liberal arts college," "teachers college," and "technological school." Additional institutions of higher learning in New York State, judged to fall within these categories which were not included in the HEW report were also sent questionnaires.

A copy of the questionnaire sent is included as Exhibit I at the end of this appendix. Forty-nine, or 60%, of the 81 questionnaires were completed and returned (42 from four-year institutions and seven from two-year institutions). A lower percentage of the two-year institutions polled responded (41%) than the four-year institutions (66%).

The purpose of the questionnaire was to determine whether college libraries would be interested in contracting for centralized processing services and under what conditions such an arrangement would be most desirable and acceptable.

The following institutions replied to the questionnaire:

Briarcliff College
Canisius College
Catherine McAuley College
Cazenovia College
Clarkson College of Technology
Colgate University
College of Mount Saint Vincent
College of Saint Rose
Concordia Collegiate Institute
Cooper Union for the Advancement of Science and Art
Dominican College of Blauvelt
Elmira College
Finch College
Hofstra University
Houghton College
Iona College
Ithaca College
Keuka College
King's College
Ladycliff College
LeMoyne College
Mannes College of Music

Maria Regina College
Marist College
Marymount College
Marymount Manhattan College
Mills College of Education
Molloy Catholic College for Women
Mount Saint Mary College
Nazareth College of Rochester
New York College of Music
Paul Smith's College of Arts
and Sciences
Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn
C. W. Post College (L.I.U.)
Queen of the Apostle College
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
Roberts Wesleyan College
Rochester Institute of Technology
Saint Bernardine of Siena College
Saint Bonaventure University
Saint John Fisher College
Saint Joseph's College for Women
Saint Lawrence University
Saint Thomas Acquinas College
Sarah Lawrence College
Southampton College (L. I. U.)
Vassar College
Wagner College
Webb Institute of Naval Architecture

Interest in Centralized Processing

Of the 49 institutions replying, 28 (57%) said they did see an advantage in the centralization of acquisition and processing of college library materials on a statewide basis, while the remaining 21 (43%) said they did not see any advantage in such a centralization.

As with the schools, the institutions were asked to rank, in order of desirability, four different plans for centralizing acquisition and processing activities. Two of the plans listed were for centers for both public and college library materials— one center handling all activities; the other center handling ordering, billing, cataloging and catalog production, but not physical processing. The other two plans involved the same two setups concerning the division of activities, but were for college library materials alone.

Table B-1 summarizes the responses of the 40 institutions which expressed preferences.

Table B-1

MOST DESIRABLE PLAN FOR CENTRALIZATION
(FIRST CHOICE)

	Center for College and Public Libraries	Center for College Libraries Only	Total
Centralization of all activities	4	25*	29
Centralization of some activities	3	10*	13
Total	7	35	42

*Two institutions selected both of these plans for first choice. Because of this, there is a total of 42 first choices shown here for the 40 institutions.

Nine of the total of 49 institutions returning questionnaires did not answer this question. Of the 40 answering, 33 chose as most desirable a plan in which the center handled only college library material. Of these, 21 indicated as most desirable "centralization of all activities in one center for college libraries alone"; seven "centralization of ordering, billing, cataloging, and catalog production in one center for college libraries only, with decentralization of physical processing of books"; and two indicated as "most desirable" both these two plans. Two institutions wrote in a first preference for regional centers for college libraries only, with one of these envisioning an eventual federation on a statewide basis. Another wrote in as most desirable "centralization of ordering and billing in one center for college libraries only with decentralization of cataloging and physical processing of books."

The second choice of these institutions further defines their preferences. Only 35 of the 40 institutions indicated a second choice, 28 selecting as second most desirable a plan for a center serving college libraries alone. Of these 28, 24 interchanged their selections and picked another plan involving just college libraries.

None of the seven institutions selecting as most desirable a plan serving both college and public libraries picked as second choice the other plan involving both kinds of libraries. Six of the seven institutions selected a plan where the center would handle the same activities, but just for college libraries. (The seventh institution chose "centralization of ordering, billing, cataloging and catalog production for both public and college libraries, with decentralization of physical processing" as most desirable and "centralization of all activities in one center for college libraries alone" as second most desirable.)

Volume Projected

The 49 institutions were also asked to indicate the maximum cost per item they would be willing to pay in contracting for centralized processing services, and the maximum time interval they would find acceptable.

Table B-2 sets out for each cost and time interval the number of institutions which expressed interest in centralized processing. The table also shows the items added in 1964-65 to the library or group of libraries for the institutions shown. For example, at a cost of $1.50 per unit processed and a four-weeks delivery, four institutions showed interest in centralized processing. Total items added to the libraries of these institutions in 1964-65 were 10,649.

Eleven schools did not answer the question about items added during the 1964-65 year; figures for volumes added during 1963-64 from the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare publication, Library Statistics of Colleges and Universities, 1963-64, have been substituted.

This table provides a basis for estimating the number of items that might be ordered and processed through the center at different levels of cost and speed. For example, if the center could process an item at $1.00 in six weeks, all the institutions setting these figures—or higher figures—as acceptable might then contract for such a service.

Table B-3 sets out in cumulative totals, at each relevant cost and time interval conjunction, items added in 1964-65 (as shown in Table B-2). Thus, at that year's rate of acquisition in these institutions, at a price of $1.00 and a six-weeks delivery, 39,095 items might have been processed.

Table B-2

COLLEGE-LEVEL INSTITUTIONS— ESTIMATED ITEMS ADDED ACCORDING TO TIME-COST SPECIFICATIONS

Maximum Unit Cost at Which Interested	Maximum Acceptable Delivery Time															
	Ten Weeks		Eight Weeks		Six Weeks		Four Weeks		Two Weeks		No Time Indicated		Not Interested at Any Speed		Total	
	No.	E.I.A.*	No.	E.I.A.	No.	E.I.A.	No.	E.I.A.	No.	E.I.A.	No.	E.I.A.	No.	E.I.A.	No.	E.I.A.
$2.00	0		0		0		2	12,403	1	10,000	0		0		3	22,403
1.75	0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0	
1.50	0		1	2,911	1	5,762	4	10,649	0		0		0		6	19,322
1.25	0		1	10,787	0		1	4,660	0		0		0		2	15,447
1.00	0		1	4,702	2	14,933	1	2,763	0		0		0		4	22,398
.75	0		0		0		2	7,445	0		0		0		2	7,445
.50	0		0		1	4,100	3	6,327	0		0		0		4	10,427
No unit cost maximum indicated	1	5,300	0		1	3,000	1	3,000	0		2	3,080	0		5	14,380
Not interested at any cost	0		0		0		0		0		0		23	130,224	23	130,224
Total	1	5,300	3	18,400	5	27,795	14	47,247	1	10,000	2	3,080	23	130,224	49	242,046

*Estimated items added according to contractor's research or Library Statistics of Colleges and Universities 1963-64, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Table B-3

COLLEGE-LEVEL INSTITUTIONS—ESTIMATED VOLUME BY TIME-COST SPECIFICATIONS

Maximum Unit Cost at Which Interested	Maximum Acceptable Delivery Time					
	Interested at Any Speed	Ten Weeks	Eight Weeks	Six Weeks	Four Weeks	Two Weeks
Interested at any cost	0	0	0	0	0	0
$2.00	0	0	0	0	12,403	22,403
$1.75	0	0	0	0	12,403	22,403
$1.50	0	0	2,911	8,673	31,725	41,725
$1.25	0	0	13,698	19,460	47,172	57,172
$1.00	0	0	18,400	39,095	69,570	79,570
.75	0	0	18,400	39,095	77,015	87,015
.50	0	0	18,400	43,195	87,442	97,442

COLLEGE LIBRARY—PUBLIC LIBRARY CATALOGING DIFFERENCES

To ascertain the extent of variation in cataloging practices among New York State college libraries, 23 college libraries which had expressed interest in centralized processing were requested to forward copies of their main entry catalog cards (complete with tracings) prepared for any titles on a list of 25. The list was compiled to represent titles which would be of general interest to college libraries and which, if acquired, were likely to have already been cataloged. Sixteen of the 25 titles were 1964 imprints, the rest 1963. Library of Congress (LC) cards had been issued for all. (See Exhibit II to this appendix.)

Thirteen (57%) of the 23 libraries sent copies of cards. Table B-4 shows the distribution of the 113 cards received as between LC and DC (Dewey Decimal Classification). The table also shows for each library the number of cards on which the original classification had been modified, and the holdings of the individual libraries in thousands.

The average number of titles cataloged by each library was 8.7 or 35% of the 25 on the list. The number of titles cataloged per library ranged from three to 16, i.e., from 12% to 64% of the list. The 13 libraries ranged in size from 15,000 to 221,000 volumes (1964 edition of American Library Directory. The average size was 75,000 volumes, the median size 72,000 volumes.

Of the 13 libraries, 12 (92%) of the total were using printed LC cards (or proof sheets). Only one library prepared typed cards for its catalog. So, for descriptive cataloging, including author and title entries, almost all libraries in the sample were willing to accept a standardized catalog card.

However, only four (31%) of the 13 libraries used LC classification on their cards; the other nine (69%) used the Dewey Decimal Classification. The libraries using LC ranged in size from 53,000 to 101,000 volumes; their average size was 79,000 and their median size 80,500 volumes. The nine libraries using DC ranged from 15,000 to 221,000 volumes; the average and median size were 74,000 and 55,000 volumes, respectively. Thus, although there are surprising extremes at both ends of the size scale for LC and DC users, the statistics indicate that the median size of college libraries (in the sample) using LC is greater than that of college libraries using DC.

Table B-4

COLLEGE LIBRARY CATALOG CARD SAMPLE

Library	Holdings (000)	Classification Used*		Cards With Classification Modified
		LC	DC	
A	221		12	7
B	120		7	4
C	101	5		1
D	95		12	9
E	94		8	3
F	89	16		3
G	72	10		2
H	55		3	1
I	53	7		1
J	30		8	3
K	18		3	3
L	15		16	5
M	15		6	5
Totals		38	75	47

*Total cards received: 113.

As noted earlier, all 25 titles were represented by LC cards, all of which carried an LC notation (which combines a classification and a book number). All but four of the 25 LC cards carried DC numbers also. Three of the four LC cards not carrying DC numbers were for fiction titles; the fourth was for a university press book.

All four libraries using LC did modify in some way the classification notation which appeared on the LC card. All nine libraries using DC also made some modification of the DC number appearing on the LC card.

Most modifications were only to shorten an LC or Dewey notation which evidently was considered too long for the needs of the user library. (Only the library using "homemade" cards assigned DC numbers differing extensively from those printed on the LC cards.) Some changes for fiction titles were made by libraries using either LC or DC.

Although all the libraries in the sample modified to some extent the DC or LC notation appearing on the LC cards, these modifications were of a minor nature and it may be anticipated that college libraries willing to accept centralized processing can also accept, without compromising the integrity of their present classification, a longer LC or Dewey notation on the LC card.

For reasons of economy and efficiency, it would be most desirable for a centralized processing agency to use LC printed cards or proof sheets as the source or model for all catalog card production. There are, unfortunately, certain practical limitations to use of LC only. LC does not catalog all books acquired by college libraries. One of the 13 libraries commented that LC did not provide cards for at least one-third of the titles cataloged by them. This suggests the volume of original cataloging that might be necessary if a centralized processing operation undertook to serve college libraries. Presumably the lack of an LC card would not preclude the use of LC principles in original cataloging and classification. An added problem would be the provision of DC notation where required by the college, either when omitted from an LC card or if original cataloging needs to be done.

COLLEGE LIBRARY — PUBLIC LIBRARY CATALOGING OVERLAP

An estimate of the duplication in cataloging between college and public libraries was made in the following way: a selection of 53 titles was made from the issues of Choice [1] published in the period March 1964, through February 1965. Choice is a standard selection tool widely used by the libraries of small colleges and other institutions which serve undergraduates. The 53 titles chosen were then matched against the union catalogs of the three New York City public library systems. The results are shown in Table B-5 below:

Table B-5

COLLEGE TITLES— PUBLIC LIBRARY CATALOGING MATCH

Total Choice Titles in Sample		Matching Public Library Titles					
		Titles Cataloged 1964-65 [2]		Titles Cataloged Other Years		Titles Not Cataloged	
No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
53	100.0	45	84.9	7	13.2	1	1.9

Forty-five (84.9%) of the sample had been cataloged by at least one of the three New York City systems in the same year as it had been listed in Choice. A further seven (13.2%) of the titles had been cataloged in other years. Only one of the 53 titles selected had not been cataloged in any of the three New York City systems.

1 Choice, published by Association of College and Research Libraries, Chicago, Illinois.
2 March 1964-February 1965.

EFFECT OF FEDERAL AID

As passed last year, the Higher Education Act authorizes federal aid in the purchase of materials for college and university libraries. The act specifies three types of grants for this purpose: 1) basic grants of a maximum of $5,000 apiece to each institution and branch located in a different community; 2) supplemental grants, awarded on the basis of up to $10 per full-time student at the involved institutions, to institutions handicapped in their overall development by inadequate libraries; and 3) special purpose grants to institutions having special library needs, or to meet special national or regional needs in the library or information sciences by encouraging the joint use of libraries. All money received under all three types of grants must be spent entirely for materials. Unlike Title II of ESEA none of the money can be spent for processing materials bought with the grants.

The basic and special purpose grants would require matching money from the institutions receiving them. An institution receiving a basic grant must maintain library expenditures from its own funds at its previous level and match the federal funds on a 1-to-1 basis. An institution receiving a special purpose grant would have to maintain library expenditures from its own funds at the level of the preceding two years and in addition match every $3 of federal money with $1 of its own.

The act as passed authorized $50,000,000 for spending in fiscal year 1966 and for each of the two following years. However, as of early March 1966, no money had been appropriated by Congress to finance the grants. In late February 1966 the President sent a request to Congress to appropriate $11,000,000 to fund the grants for the period through June 30, 1966. As of this writing Congress has not acted on this request. It is not clear what Congress will do in regard to it, although representatives of the American Library Association in Washington are hopeful that the legislators will pass the appropriation. It is not known what appropriations, if any, will be requested to finance subsequent years of this Title, although— again— the Washington representatives of the ALA are hopeful that the $50,000,000 annually authorized by the bill for fiscal 1967 and 1968 will be appropriated by Congress. It is by no means certain that this will happen, however. The recent increases in defense expenditures diminish but do not yet rule out completely the chances of the full monies being voted for Title II as authorized.

If the $11,000,000 is voted for the rest of this fiscal year, it is expected by New York State government officials most concerned with such matters that the state would get about $1,000,000 of it. They also expect that for any sums voted in later periods to finance this Title the state would get about the same percentage of whatever money is appropriated.

On the basis of these estimates and research carried out in the course of this study, it is possible to make very rough estimates of the volume of federally financed college materials which the recommended system might be expected to handle.

In making the estimates a total annual appropriation of $50,000,000 for the country has been assumed. Of this it has been estimated that New York State would get one-eleventh or 9.1% or $4,550,000. Of this amount, according to the provisions of the Title, 85% or $3,867,500 would be for the basic and supplemental grants and the remaining 15% or $682,500 for the special grants.

There are now about 215 institutions in the state eligible for the basic grants. It is expected that if the full $50,000,000 were voted most of these institutions would be able to to take advantage of the grants. In these calculations it has been assumed that 200 of the institutions would receive basic grants. This would require $1,000,000 of the 85%— $3,867,500. As will be remembered, those receiving basic grants are required to supply matching funds of equal amounts to increase their library expenditures. But this matching money does not need to be spent on library materials. It can be spent for any of the many other expenses necessary in running a library. It has been assumed here that none of the matching money for the basic grants will be used to buy additional materials. Rather, it is expected that this money will be spent for the most part on processing the materials bought with the basic grants. It has further been assumed that the remainder of the 85% or $2,867,500 will be distributed in supplementary grants and will be used to purchase materials.

The special purpose grants require the recipient to increase its library expenditures from its own funds $1 for every $3 received from the federal government. Again, however, it has been assumed that none of the matching money will be spent on purchasing additional materials but will be used for the most part in processing the materials bought with grant money or for administering the joint projects which will be aided by the special purpose grants.

There would thus be an estimated increase of $4,550,000 in annual expenditures for library materials under the conditions assumed. It is difficult to estimate how many items such an amount would buy. There is no single reliable figure available for the average cost at present of an item (excluding processing expenses) purchased for a college library. After taking into account a study of printed sources bearing on this question and discussions with government officials involved in the administering of Title II of the Higher Education Act and with Professor Tauber, consultant to the contractor for this study, an average cost of $5 per item has been assumed. Employing the $5 average cost per item figure, a total of 910,000 additional items would be purchased annually for the libraries of college- and university-level institutions of the state with the federal funds. The results are shown in Table B-6.

Table B-6

ESTIMATED ANNUAL PURCHASES OF MATERIALS
FOR COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
IN NEW YORK STATE
GENERATED BY HIGHER EDUCATION ACT

	Federal Grants
Basic Grants	$1,000,000
Supplemental Grants	2,867,500
Special Purpose Grants	682,500
Total Funds	$4,550,000
Items at $5 an Item	910,000

Exhibit I

ACQUISITION AND PROCESSING OF COLLEGE LIBRARY MATERIAL

In order to take full advantage of modern, money-saving equipment and techniques in the acquisition and processing of library and instructional materials, centralization of clerical and repetitive operations becomes a major factor. Among the many questions raised when considering the idea of centralization as applied to the acquisition, cataloging and processing of materials are the following:

a) How much does it cost? i.e., how much is the college library willing to pay?,
b) What does the college library get for what it pays?, and
c) How fast does the college library get what it orders?

Any attempt at centralization of these services should consider carefully the foregoing questions.

Your answers to the following questions will be of decided importance in helping to improve college library service in the state.

1. Do you see any advantage in centralization of acquisition and processing of materials on a state-wide basis? Yes_____ No_____

2. Regardless of the answer to the preceding question, please fill in the appropriate columns below. Indicate your opinion as to whether you see advantages or disadvantages in the following list of possible areas of centralization by checking the appropriate column:

Areas Affected by Centralization	Advantages	Disadvantages
Accuracy of ordering and receiving	_____	_____
Speed of ordering and receiving	_____	_____
Efficiency of billing	_____	_____
Rates of discounts on materials purchased	_____	_____
Level of cataloging	_____	_____
Uniformity of catalogs	_____	_____
Accessibility of bibliographic information state-wide	_____	_____
Physical processing of library materials	_____	_____
Shipping and delivery of library materials	_____	_____
Service to students and teachers	_____	_____
Inter-library loans	_____	_____
Overall costs	_____	_____
Administration and communication	_____	_____

3. Assuming that a state-wide system for processing of materials for public libraries has, in addition, the capability of handling college library needs in the state, how would you rank the following alternatives in terms of desirability? (mark most desirable "1", second most desirable "2", and so on.)

a) Centralization of all activities in one center for both public and college libraries _____

b) Centralization of ordering, billing, cataloging, and catalog production for both public and college libraries, with decentralization of physical processing _____

c) Centralization of all activities in one center for college libraries alone _____

d) Centralization of ordering, billing, cataloging, and catalog production in one center for college libraries only, with decentralization of physical processing of books _____

e) Other (please specify)_____

_____

_____ _____

4. Are there any cooperative plans between your library and

	Yes	No
a) other college libraries in the state	____	____
b) school libraries in public or private schools in the state	____	____
c) public libraries or public library systems in the state	____	____

If "Yes" which of the following areas are covered by your cooperative plans?

Acquisitions of books	_____
Acquisitions of non-book materials	_____
Cataloging and processing	_____
Borrowing privileges	_____
Other (please specify)	
_____	
_____	_____

5. Please fill in the appropriate sections of this question.

Our college library would be:

a) Interested in contracting for centralized processing services only if the average cost per item does not exceed: $.50_____, $.75_____, $1.00_____, $1.25_____, $1.50_____, $1.75_____, $2.00_____.

b) Interested in contracting for centralized processing services only if the average time lag between ordering (a book published and in print, or any item available on the market) and receiving the finished product does not exceed: 2 weeks_____, 4 weeks_____, 6 weeks_____, 8 weeks_____, 10 weeks_____.

c) Interested in contracting for centralized processing services regardless of cost or speed because it is the only logical way to achieve certain services (reported in answers to question 2). _____

d) Not interested in contracting for centralized processing services in any case because we expect certain inherent problems (reported in answers to question 2). _____

6. Characteristics of the college library collection:

a) Expenditures 1964/65 $_____

b) Expenditures - estimate 1969/1970 $_____

c) Total number of different titles added 1964/65 _____ Titles

d) Total number of different titles at end of 1964/65 _____ Titles

e) Total number of items added 1964/65 _____ Items

f) Total number of items at end of 1964/65 _____ Items

g) Total number of items withdrawn at end of 1964/65 _____ Items

h) Total number of periodical titles received at end of 1964/65 _____ Titles

7. How do you get library materials processed?

- by college library staff _____
- by an arrangement with a commercial processing center _____
- by an arrangement with a school system _____

- by an arrangement with a public library _____
- by an arrangement with a public library system _____
- by an arrangement with another college library _____
- other (please specify)_____

_____ _____

8. Total cost of materials processing paid in 1964/65:

- Ordering and billing
- Cataloging and classification
- Book preparation
- Filing and maintenance of the catalogs

TOTAL $_____

9. Cataloging and classification

a) Classification system followed in your library:

	Edition
- Dewey Decimal classification - unabridged	_____
- Dewey Decimal classification - abridged	_____
- Library of Congress classification	_____
- Other (please specify)_____	
_____	_____

b) Subject headings lists:

- Library of Congress list	_____
- Sears list	_____
- Other (please specify)_____	
_____	_____

c) Do you use Cutter numbers? Yes_____No_____

10. Which of the following catalogs do you maintain?

Catalog	Approx. No. of Titles Included	Approx. Total Cards	Approx. Cards Included				Form of Arrangement	
			Wilson Cards %	L. C. Cards %	Home-made Cards %	Other %	Dictionary	Divided
Official catalog (for staff use only - if more than one, list separately)								
Public catalog (for general use - comprehensive)								
Divisional or departmental catalog (if more than one, list separately)								
Name authority file								
Subject authority file								
Shelf list								

Exhibit II

STUDY OF CENTRALIZED PROCESSING IN NEW YORK STATE PUBLIC LIBRARY SYSTEMS

Catalog Card Copies Requested: College Titles List

Asimov, Isaac	The Human Brain, Illustrated by Anthony Ravielli, Houghton, 1964
Barth, Karl	God Here and Now, Harper and Row, 1964
Bloomfield, Morton W.	A Linguistic Introduction to the History of English, Knopf, 1963
Brecht, Bertolt	Brecht on Theatre, Hill & Wang, 1964
Crane, Stephen	Complete Short Stories and Sketches, Edited by Thomas A. Gullason, Doubleday, 1963
Dostoevsky, Fyodor	Crime and Punishment, Translated by Constance Garnett, Dodd, 1963
Feis, Herbert	Foreign Aid and Foreign Policy, St. Martin's, 1964
Franklin, Benjamin	The Autobiography of B. Franklin, Edited by Leonard W. Labaree, Yale University Press, 1964
Friedman, Maurice, ed.	The Worlds of Existentialism, Random House 1964
Genet, Jean	The Thief's Journal, Translated by Bernard Frechtman, Grove Press, 1964
Gossett, Thomas F.	Race; The History of an Idea in America, Southern Methodist University Press, 1963
Greep, Roy O., ed.	Human Fertility and Population Problems, Schenkman Pub. Co., 1963
Gruen, Victor	The Heart of Our Cities, Simon & Schuster, 1964

Catalog Card Copies Requested: College Titles List

Hammarskjöld, Dag	Markings, Knopf, 1964
Jensen, Lawrence N.	Synthetic Painting Media, Prentice-Hall, 1964
Kennedy, John F.	America, The Beautiful, Country Beautiful Foundation, 1964
Kovach, Ladis D.	Computer-Oriented Mathematics, Holden-Day, 1964
Lederer, Esther P.	Ann Landers Talks to Teen-Agers About Sex, Prentice-Hall, 1963
May, Edgar	The Wasted Americans, Harper, 1964
Mencken, Henry L.	The American Language, Knopf, 1963
Menninger, Karl A.	The Vital Balance, Viking, 1963
Ruitenbeek, Hendrik M., ed.	Psychoanalysis and Literature, Dutton 1964
Shelford, Victor E.	The Ecology of North America, University of Illinois Press, 1963
Selye, Hans	From Dream to Discovery, McGraw-Hill, 1964
Toser, Marie A.	Library Manual, 6th ed., H. W. Wilson, 1964